

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRAIDEN F. WILSON et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cr-00093-LK

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter comes before the Court sua sponte. Defendant Chandler Bennett filed an Appeal of the Detention Order from Magistrate Judge, Dkt. No. 73, that violated the Local Criminal Rules in numerous ways, including significantly exceeding the applicable length limit, Dkt. No. 85 at 3; CrR 12(b)(5). Her reply brief once again violated Local Criminal Rule 12(b)(5): she again failed to include a word count certification, and her brief was overlength by roughly 150 words. *See* Dkt. No. 85 at 3 (citing Dkt. No. 84).

The Court explained in its order denying Ms. Bennett’s “appeal” that it was “immaterial that Ms. Bennett combined [her] reply” in support of her appeal “with her reply regarding her pending motion to compel treatment; she does not identify which portions of her reply relate to

1 which motion, and she instead appears to seek consideration of the entirety of the reply with respect
2 to both motions.” *Id.* at 5 n.3. The Court noted that it would separately address whether it should
3 strike the reply in its entirety in relation to Ms. Bennett’s pending motion to compel treatment. *Id.*;
4 *see also* Dkt. No. 67 (Motion to Compel Treatment).

5 The Court now ORDERS Ms. Bennett to show cause why her reply brief should not be
6 stricken in its entirety in relation to her motion to compel treatment for failure to comply with the
7 Local Criminal Rules. Her response to this order to show cause, which must not exceed three
8 pages, is due by September 3, 2024. The Government may file a reply, not to exceed three pages,
9 by September 6, 2024. No further briefing will be accepted on this issue.

10 Dated this 28th day of August, 2024.

11 

12

Lauren King
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24